

To Louis November 29

United States
Philadelphia
RECEIVED
NOV 4 1
U. S. MINT, P

Enclosed I return you
the memorandum for Gold
Bullion deposited with at the
U.S. Mint October 14th asking
you to kindly look into the
matter as I believe some
mistake has been made by
you.

The Bar sent you weighed
before melting 15 ³³/₃ and after
melting 14 ¹³/₃ showing to have
sustained a loss ~~in~~ from
melting ¹/₃ ²⁰/₃ which seems
rather disproportionate, and
as I see that the figures
14 ¹³/₃ after melting have been
corrected it is possible that

an error has been made
if so, kindly rectify accordingly
Respectfully Yours

L. Folsom
5014 A Park St

306

St Louis, Mo
 Nov. 2nd 1895

J. Mohlich writes
 about Gold Bullion deposit
 and discrepancy in weight,
 Believes there has been a mistake,
 send back the Mint Memorandum
 and asks for examination and
 explanation—

Mem Return Nov. 8th 1895

101 2 19 1/2 pack

The deposit in question
was melted twice

The loss in the first
melting was $\frac{19}{100}$ of an ounce

The loss in remelting was
 $\frac{10\frac{1}{2}}{100}$ ounces.

The deposit was ordered
remelted by the Assayer
The first melting not
being homogenous a correct
Assay could not be reported
a refining flux was used
in the second melting. The
loss in weight always increases
the fineness of the metal.
There is no loss of the precious
metals, only of the base alloys

Yours
Wm. C.

Memorandum

NARA RG104, Entry 1, Box 191

[Abstract:] Writes about gold bullion deposit and discrepancy in weight...

St. Louis
November 2, 1895

United States Mint
Philadelphia, Pa.

Enclosed I return you the memorandum for Gold Bullion deposited with at the U.S. Mint October 14th asking you to kindly look into the matter as I believe to me mistake has been made by you.

The Bar sent you weighed before melting 15.33 oz and after melting 14.13 oz showing to have sustained a loss from melting of 1.20 oz. which seems rather disproportional, and as I see that the figures 14.13 after melting have been corrected it is possible that an error has been made if so. Kindly rectify & oblige,

Respectfully Yours
J. Frohlich
2314 A. Park Ave.

[Enclosed note:]

The deposit in question was melted twice. The loss in the first melting was 19/100 of an ounce. The loss in remelting was 1.01 ounces. The Deposit was ordered remelted by the Assayer. The first melting not being homogeneous a correct Assay could not be reported a refining flux was used in the second melting, the loss in weight always increases the fineness of the metal. There is no loss of the precious metals, only of the base alloy.

J. Grues
Wgh. Clrk.

Mem. Ret'd. Encl.